

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT		1. CONTRACT ID CODE		PAGE OF PAGES 1 17	
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. PR-HQ-05-12521/0002		3. EFFECTIVE DATE 02/17/06		4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. PR-HQ-05-12521	
6. ISSUED BY Environmental Protection Agency Bid and Proposal Room, Ariel Rios Building (3802R) 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20460		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6)		5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)	
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)		(✓)		9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. PR-HQ-05-12521	
		✓		9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11)	
				10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
				10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE		FACILITY CODE			
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS					
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers <input type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is not extended.</p> <p>Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:</p> <p>(a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning <u>1</u> copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.</p>					
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)					
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.					
(✓)	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A				
	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).				
	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:				
	D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)				
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.					
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)					
The purpose of this amendment is to:					
1) Revise the bullet relating to Government evaluation of the offeror's Continuity of Operations Plan under Provision M.5, "Evaluation Factors for Award" to be consistent with the change included in amendment 1, question 61.					
2) Revise section 1.3.5 of Attachment 5					
3) Add Attachment 18, "Questions and Answers #2, dated 02/17/2006."					
4) Add the clause at 52.204-9, Personal Identity Verification of Contractor Personnel (JAN 2006) to Section H of the solicitation.					
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.					
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)			
		YVONNE D. STISO			
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	16C. DATE SIGNED		
_____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)		_____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)			
NSN 7540-01-152-8070 PREVIOUS EDITION UNUSABLE		30-105		STANDARD FORM 30 (REV 10-83) Prescribed by GSA FAR (48 CFR) 52.243	

AMENDMENTS TO THE SOLICITATION

1. The Section M clause entitled "EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD (EPAAR 1552.215-71) (AUG 1999)" has been modified. The text is as follows:

(a) The Government will make award to the responsible offeror(s) whose offer conforms to the solicitation and is most advantageous to the Government cost or other factors considered. For this solicitation, all evaluation factors other than cost or price when combined are significantly more important than cost or price.

(b) Evaluation factors and significant subfactors to determine quality of product or service:

Minimum Qualifications Matrix

The Minimum Qualifications Matrix will be evaluated on a **pass/fail basis**, as set forth in the provision entitled "MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS MATRIX". Offers which do not receive a rating of "pass" under this criterion are not eligible for award.

Factor 1 - Technical Merit**375 Points****Sub-Factor 1.A. - Technical and Functional Evaluation****225 Points**

Under Sub-Factor 1.A, the proposed Software Solution is of relatively greater weight than implementation or hosting. Implementation and hosting are of equal weight.

For the proposed Software Solution, the evaluation areas described in the first two (2) bullets below are each more important than any of the other remaining individual bullets under Software Solution. EPA will evaluate:

- The Offeror's thoroughness and rationale to support the recommended software solution and its components;
- The degree to which the Offeror's solution complies with the requirements specified in the Requirements Response Matrices;
- The Offeror's demonstrated understanding of EPA's FSMP objectives and business and technical environment from a functional perspective;
- The degree to which the proposed solution can accommodate future requirements;
- The efficiency and effectiveness of the Offeror's release management approach for the proposed software, to determine product stability;
- The Offeror's commitment to the federal market and e-Government initiatives; (i.e., provides adapters to CCR, e-Travel, etc., sponsors user support groups, describes portion of budget applied to research and development activities);

- The ability of the proposed solution to fit within EPA Enterprise Architecture (refer to the CONOPs for further information on EPA Enterprise Architecture);
- The completeness and appropriateness of the portion of the Offeror's risk management plan applicable to the proposed software solution; and
- The validity and reasonableness of the Offeror's software solution assumptions.

For Implementation, the evaluation areas described in the first five (5) bullets are each more important than any of the other remaining individual bullets listed under Implementation.

EPA will evaluate:

- Elements of the offeror's proposed Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP) related to implementation. The QASP will be evaluated based on the following criteria;
 - Offeror's identification of meaningful, applicable performance standards that address EPA objectives;
 - The reasonableness of the Offeror's Acceptable Quality levels and the likelihood that they will provide incentive for the successful offeror to perform at a high level;
 - The reasonableness of the Offeror's proposed monitoring methods, including verifiability of the measures by EPA and a recommended approach that minimizes the burden on EPA;
 - The reasonableness and effectiveness of the Offeror's overall incentive strategy; and
 - The soundness of the Offeror's plan to update the QASP throughout the life of the project.
- The Offeror's demonstrated understanding of the FSMP objectives and EPA's business and technical environment;
- The thoroughness and realistic nature of the proposed implementation schedule (e.g., activities, durations, dependencies, resources);
- The thoroughness and effectiveness of the Offeror's proposed data migration and conversion strategy;
- The effectiveness and efficiency of the Offeror's technical approach for integrating the proposed components; and the approach for integrating the proposed components with non-FSMP systems (e.g., availability of pre-built integration adapters / connectors among components of solution and between solution and other applications);
- Overall effectiveness and efficiency of the Offeror's approach to move EPA from the current to the future state and the rationale to support the approach;

- The extent to which the Offeror's approach meets Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI) Level 3 criteria. A copy of the most recent certification must be included in the response to the RFP. Other evidence may be provided, but will not have the weight of CMMI certification;
- The completeness and appropriateness of the portion of the Offeror's risk management plan applicable to implementation; and
- The validity and reasonableness of the Offeror's implementation assumptions.

For Hosting, the evaluation areas described in the first two (2) bullets below are each more important than any of the other remaining individual bullets under Hosting. EPA will evaluate:

- The Offeror's self-evaluation against the Financial Management Line of Business, Center of Excellence, Due Diligence Checklist;
- The completeness and appropriateness of the Offeror's proposed service level agreement;
- The Offeror's self assessment against the Tier III criteria established by the Uptime Institute® ;
- The Offeror's most recent Type II SAS 70 evaluation;
- The Offeror's self assessment against the security controls for moderate baseline systems as defined in NIST 800-53;
- The release management methodology of upgrades and patches provided by the software vendor;
- The completeness and appropriateness of the portion of the Offeror's risk management plan applicable to the proposed hosting solution;
- The description of the offeror's Continuity of Operations Plan against the recommended elements of such plans, as specified in NIST publication 800-34;
- Documentation supporting successful Disaster Recovery Plan Testing; and
- The validity and reasonableness of the Offeror's hosting assumptions.

Sub-Factor 1.B - Organizational Experience and Past Performance 94 Points

The Offeror's Organizational Experience and Past Performance will be evaluated based on the offeror's discussion of its organizational experience and information obtained from the Offeror's references and from other sources.

Organizational Experience- EPA will evaluate the Offeror's corporate experience with commensurate public sector projects of similar size, scope and complexity. In addition, EPA will evaluate the Offeror's experience with the components of the proposed solution. EPA may contact references to verify experience regarding contractors, subcontractors, and staff.

Past Performance- EPA will evaluate Offeror's corporate and individual past performance including the relevance of the references provided in comparison to EPA's FSMP scope, size and complexity and whether the Offeror has provided references that meet all of the required categories as outlined in the Instructions to Offerors. Substantially greater weight will be given to past performance in engagements involving the key personnel being proposed for the FSMP.

EPA will evaluate Offeror's past performance as a measure of the degree to which an Offeror and its proposed sub contractors and key personnel have satisfied its customers to include:

- the quality and timeliness of the work;
- ability to estimate costs accurately and to control those cost to stay within budget;
- business behavior and commitment to customer satisfaction; and
- technical and management capabilities.

Sub-Factor 1.C - Management Approach

56 Points

Sub-Factor 1.C consists of Management Approach and Personnel.

The Offeror's Management Approach will be evaluated based on the following. The two (2) main bullets under Management Approach are listed in descending order of importance:

- The Offeror's ability to manage the project as evidenced by the adequacy of the detailed management and control plan/procedures proposed to include:
 - The thoroughness and reasonableness of the risk management approach and mitigation strategies;
 - The efficiency and effectiveness of the Offeror's Quality Control Plan to ensure quality and the achievement of FSMP objectives;
 - The extent to which the Offeror's Partnership strategy demonstrates an understanding of the required collaboration and communication mechanisms necessary to efficiently and effectively manage the project;
 - The extent to which the Offeror's staffing approach demonstrates an understanding of the resources necessary to support the overall FSMP solution and implementation. The reasonableness and suitability of the proposed mix of personnel (both in terms of labor categories and number of people) will be evaluated for realistic and appropriate nature.
 - The Offeror's demonstration of its corporate commitment to the FSMP objectives by making the resulting contract a corporate priority;

-The Offeror's Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP) - The QASP criteria associated with Project Management, will be evaluated under Management Approach in accordance with the following criteria;

- * Offeror's inclusion of meaningful, applicable performance standards that address project management;

- *The reasonableness of the Offeror's Acceptable Quality levels and the likelihood that they will provide incentive for the successful offeror to perform at a high level; and

- *The reasonableness of the Offeror's proposed monitoring methods (including earned value management), including verifiability of the measures by EPA and a recommended approach that minimizes the burden on EPA.

-The validity and reasonableness of the management approach assumptions.

- The extent to which the Offeror's management approach demonstrates an understanding of the management complexities of the overall effort. Offerors will be evaluated on the quality and thoroughness of their management plan and how the supporting management structure will operate to meet the requirements of the contract.

EPA will evaluate the Offeror's proposed personnel to include:

- The extent to which the Offeror's identification of key and non-key personnel demonstrates an understanding of the EPA environment and is consistent with the proposed solution.
- Key Personnel and members of the proposed staff have experience in the implementation of the proposed solution;

- Key Personnel have the appropriate credentials (e.g. Project Manager is PMI-certified or equivalent). Equivalence should include education and experience equal to that required for PMI certification. See the PMI credentials handbook at: http://www.pmi.org/info/PDC_PMPHandbook.pdf. Evidence of successful learning should be provided through successful completion of certificate exams by generally recognized project management institutions or relevant degree from accredited institutions. Evidence of commitment to continuing education should also be provided.; and

- The proposed personnel are fully qualified to perform assigned functions based on their education, skills and experience.

- Proposed utilization of key personnel in performance of the effort; and
- The validity and reasonableness of the personnel assumptions.

Factor 2 - Oral Presentation and
Solution Demonstration Evaluation (OP\SD)

125 Points

EPA will evaluate the OP\SD based on the Offeror's overall understanding of the FSMP, the composition and demonstration of skills of the Offeror's team, and the ability of the solution (as demonstrated) to meet critical EPA needs described in the business scenarios provided to the Offerors.

Sub-Factor 2.A - Oral Presentation

25 Points

The Oral Presentation accounts for 20% of the OP\SD score. The oral presentation will be evaluated based on the following elements:

- The extent to which the presentation demonstrates the Offeror's understanding of e-gov initiatives;
- The extent to which the presentation demonstrates the Offeror's understanding of the FSMP requirements; and
- The extent to which the presentation demonstrates the Offeror's knowledge, expertise and ability to satisfy the goals and objectives of FSMP.

Sub-Factor 2.B - Solution Demonstration

100 Points

The Solution Demonstration accounts for 80% of the OP\SD score. The Solution Demonstration will be conducted to evaluate how the Offeror's solution meets the functional and technical requirements of this solicitation, as defined in the business scenarios. In addition, the demonstration will provide input for validating the accuracy of the offeror's response to the requirements response matrix. The Solution Demonstration will be evaluated based on the following elements:

- The quality of and extent to which the solution demonstrates the business scenarios and the Offeror's understanding of the business objectives of these scenarios;
- The extent to which the solution reflects the Offeror's knowledge, expertise and ability to satisfy the goals and objectives of FSMP;
- Navigation and ease of use qualities; and
- The effectiveness and performance of the Offeror's team during the demonstration.

2. The attachment entitled "INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE PREPARATION OF PROPOSALS" has been modified. The text is as follows:

THIS ATTACHMENT IS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE. THE FULL TEXT OF THE ATTACHMENT IS AVAILABLE ON THE EPA WEBSITE FOR THIS REQUIREMENT:

http://www.epa.gov/oamhpod1/adm_placement/fsmp/index.htm

- **THIS ATTACHMENT IS REVISED UNDER AMENDMENT 1.** THE FULL TEXT OF THE REVISED ATTACHMENT IS AVAILABLE ON THE EPA WEBSITE FOR THIS REQUIREMENT: http://www.epa.gov/oamhpod1/adm_placement/fsmp/index.htm
- **THIS ATTACHMENT IS REVISED UNDER AMENDMENT 2.** THE FULL TEXT OF THE REVISED ATTACHMENT IS AVAILABLE ON THE EPA WEBSITE FOR THIS REQUIREMENT: http://www.epa.gov/oamhpod1/adm_placement/fsmp/index.htm

3. The attachment entitled "QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS #2, DATED 02/17/06" has been added. The text is as follows:

PR-HQ-05-12521 Questions and Answers #2, dated 02/17/2006

67. Attachment 7, Requirements Response Matrices, general question. We understand the government's interest in complying with current and emerging Federal accounting requirements. The RFP includes requirements from the 2/2005 FSIO draft. However, we believe there have been subsequent FSIO drafts in which many requirements changed from the previous 2/2005 draft (e.g. elimination of less pertinent requirements). Does the government intend to (a) have solution providers respond to the older FSIO draft requirements, including requirements that may not be part of the finalized FSIO specification or (b) modify the RFP to reflect a more recent FSIO requirement set?

ANSWER 67: Please refer to the Government's answer to question 53 included in amendment 0001 to the solicitation.

68. Attachment 5, Section L, 1.1, Fonts, page 1. The Government specifies font sizes for proposal text and tables but does not address graphical illustrations, e.g., flow charts, organizational charts, etc. To allow contractors to development meaningful and detailed illustrative figures and graphics will the Government allow 8-point Arial font sizes?

ANSWER 68: Yes, offerors may use 8-point arial font sizes within graphic illustrations. The required font sizes for proposal text and tables remain unchanged.

69. CONOPS, Appendix D, Table D-1, page 109
In the Concept of Operations document, are the users of the OPPIN system (1000) included in the IFMS Financial users (1000) or are they in addition to the 1000 IFMS users?

ANSWER 69: The users of the OPPIN system are in addition to the 1000 IFMS users.

70. Attachment 5, Section L, 1.2.3, Tab B, Bullet Change Management Approach, sub bullet Training: Does the EPA wish us to deploy FSMP training courses via an internal learning management system capability? If so, please provide some idea of its capabilities. Or does the EPA wish us to include a project learning management system (LMS) for the

life of the project and include its cost in our budget?

ANSWER 70: The offeror should assume full responsibility for providing the training necessary to support the proposed solution.

71. Section L.12, page L-5, General Financial and Organizational Information
(a) In which Volume and Volume order does the Government request that this section be placed?

Answer 71(a): Please refer to the Government's answer to question 11 included in amendment 0001 to the solicitation.

(b) Likewise, any other documents that need signatures but not specifically stated in the RFP, e.g., Provisions by Reference.

Answer 71(b): Please include signed documents of the type described above in Volume 6.

72. Attachment 5, Section L, 1.2.3, Tab D, sub bullet The Offerors shall submit letters of Commitment with Subcontractors, page 13
Do the letters of Commitment from the subcontractors count in the overall Volume 3 page count of 145 pages? Where in Volume 3 organization does the Government request that the letters be located?

ANSWER 72: Please refer to the Government's answer to question 60 included in amendment 0001 to the solicitation.

73. Section L.19, Page L.13, Subcontracting Program Plan
This section requires a subcontracting plan to be submitted as Attachment A in Volume 3 of the proposal. Is this attachment excluded from the 145 page limit for Volume 3?

ANSWER 73: Please refer to the Government's answer to question 55 included in amendment 0001 to the solicitation.

74. CONOPS, pages 62 and 63
EPA describes the technical initiatives that will impact the FSMP project. Among other things, EPA describes its Enterprise Portal and EAI/ETL integration tools. May we assume that EPA will perform any FSMP integration activities within these applications, or will the selected vendor provide these services?

ANSWER 74: As noted in Attachment 5, Tab B, "In proposing an implementation strategy, Offerors are not constrained by the approaches described in the CONOPS and EPA reference material posted on its website, as long as the recommended strategy results in improved performance, efficient and effective business processes, lower cost or early accomplishment of milestones." The instructions under Tab B also specify that "(T)he Offeror shall provide a description of each proposed interface to include the use of pre-built components, core system development tools, or third party tools. The Offeror shall rank the level of effort for each task using the scale below. See Section 2.2.1 and Chapter 3 of the CONOPS, and SOO Appendix A for a diagram and list of interfaces." The Offeror should specify its assumptions regarding the

use of EPA enterprise tools and related integration activities.

75. Attachment 5, Section L, 1.2.3, Tab B, Bullet Product Acceptance Test Approach, page 8
EPA describes a Product Acceptance Test (PAT) that the selected vendor will perform to demonstrate how requirements will be met "out-of-the-box" and identify application limitations or gaps. (a) Does EPA anticipate that the selected vendor will start general implementation activities while the PAT is ongoing, or should the vendor expect to begin those activities only after the PAT is completed? (b) If the vendor may start implementation activities while the PAT is ongoing, will government subject matter experts be available to work with the vendor team?

ANSWER 75(a): As part of the offeror's Project Management Plan submitted in its Performance Work Statement, the offeror will identify the assumptions contained in the proposal and highlight those which have cost and schedule impacts. This shall include identification by task area of the date by which EPA must authorize the offeror to start working. The successful offeror's proposal will be incorporated into the resultant contract or IAG. The selected vendor is expected to perform the services as ordered by the Government. EPA will order, at a minimum, the PAT.

ANSWER 75(b): For task orders issued under the contract, the Government intends to conform to the contractor's assumptions, including the use of EPA resources by task area.

76. Attachment 5, Section 1.3

(a) Given the government released the demo scripts with the final RFP on 1/6/06 and instructions received around scheduling, what is planned start date for the oral presentation and solution demonstration?

ANSWER 76(a): As stated in Attachment 5, Section 1.3, "The order in which Offerors shall conduct their presentations will be determined by random drawing by the Contracting Officer (CO). The CO will contact each Offeror to establish a date and time for the offeror to make its OP\SD and to verify the location for the OP\SD. Presentations will be scheduled with offerors as soon as possible after the closing date for receipt of proposals. The OP\SDs will be scheduled as tightly as possible, but the schedule will be dependent upon the number of offers received."

(b) "The OP\SD and all associated materials provided to EPA shall be in support of the proposed solution ...". Please confirm if offeror is permitted to distribute "leave behinds" during the orals and solution demonstration?

ANSWER 76(b): As stated in Attachment 5, Section 1.3.4, "Offerors shall provide eleven (11) copies of their oral presentation slides. The offeror may not bring any reference or resource materials to the presentation;" and in Section 1.3.5 "The Offeror is expected to

supplement the data provided with additional mock data, as required to facilitate the demonstrations. Any such additional data used should be described in a sufficient manner to participants in the OP/SD process and/or provided in hard copy for reference as appropriate (e.g., if significant in quantity or complex in nature)."
Offerors are required provide eleven copies of their oral presentation slides (see Attachment 5, Section 1.3). In addition, amendment 1 to the solicitation revised Attachment 5, Section 1.3.5 to allow offerors to distribute supporting materials not to exceed 10 pages for each topic areas covered in the solution demonstration.

(c) Given EPA will evaluate "the OP/SD and all associated materials" for consistency with FSMP scope, will the material need to be provided in advance?

ANSWER 76 (c): *No, any materials to be provided to the EPA in support of the OP/SD are to be provided at the start of the OP/SD session.*

Sec 1.3 indicates the number of EPA participants will be provided to offerors when OP/SD sessions are scheduled. Does EPA plan that the same group of EPA participants will attend every demonstration session?

ANSWER 76(d): *Yes.*

77. Attachment 5, Section 1.3.3
 "This agenda may be modified in the event that an Offeror proposes an EPA legacy system as the solution for one of the topic areas (e.g., Budget Formulation). In this instance, one hour will be set aside to enable the Offeror to discuss their approach for integrating the EPA legacy system and ensuring that EPA's requirements in that area are met". Does this condition extend to EPA's current Help Desk systems and processes?

ANSWER 77: *Yes. However, unless the proposal covering Help Desk systems and processes is clearly linked to a solution demonstration topic area, the discussion should be included in the oral presentation segment of the offeror's proposal.*

78. Attachment 5, Section 1.3.4- The offeror may not bring any reference or resource materials to the presentation". Please clarify further what this means. Does this apply to any materials the offeror will intend to use in support the proposed solution and the oral presentation slides?

ANSWER 78: *Please refer to the Government's answer to question 62 included in amendment 0001 to the solicitation, and the answer to question 76 included in this amendment.*

79. Attachment 5, Section 1.3.5- "the Offeror may modify the order in which the scenarios are presented. Notification of any proposed modification to the order of the scenarios must be received in writing by the deadline for proposal submissions". If the offeror decides to change the order of the scenarios, would this impact on travel schedules and logistics for EPA participants?

ANSWER 79: *No*

80. Attachment 16, Demo Script 5.2.2 Document Imaging
Should a document imaging solution be considered in scope for FSMP?
Does FSMP have a preference or preselected solution for document imaging?

ANSWER 80: EPA's requirement is for the solution to provide the capability to electronically image, index, store, and retrieve document reference material (e.g., signed contracts, purchase orders and vendor invoices). EPA has selected Documentum as its standard platform for records and document management applications.

81. Attachment 5, Tab B, Technical and Functional Methodology, Approach to Hosting (pg. 9)
For hosted applications, may the contractor use EPA's central technology help desk as a first point of contact for user help calls? If so, what ticketing software does EPA use to record and route user inquiries?

ANSWER 81: See Clause C.1 (the Statement of Objectives), part 1.5.8 "FSMP Help Desk support will be provided by the awardee as 2nd tier, with 1st tier support provided by the EPA." EPA uses Remedy software to support help desk operations.

82. In the CONOPS Section 3.2.1 Automated Interfaces, please provide a full list of the Web Sphere product suite used for EPA's EAI architecture?

ANSWER 82: EPA is using the WebSphere Business Integration Interchange Server and Toolset, and has under license any other IBM WebSphere Business Integration Adapters required for the integration tasks mentioned in the CONOPS.

83. In the CONOPS Section 3.2.1 Automated Interfaces, does EPA expect the integrator to use the Web Sphere products and tools for the development of the interface?

ANSWER 83: As noted in Attachment 5, Tab B, "In proposing an implementation strategy, Offerors are not constrained by the approaches described in the CONOPS and EPA reference material posted on its website, as long as the recommended strategy results in improved performance, efficient and effective business processes, lower cost or early accomplishment of milestones." The instructions under Tab B also specify that "(T)he Offeror shall provide a description of each proposed interface to include the use of pre-built components, core system development tools, or third party tools. The Offeror shall rank the level of effort for each task using the scale below. See Section 2.2.1 and Chapter 3 of the CONOPS, and SOO Appendix A for a diagram and list of interfaces." The Offeror should specify its assumptions regarding the use of EPA enterprise tools and related integration activities.

84. In the CONOPS Section 3.2.1, please confirm that the Web Sphere product suite should be used for the development of the interfaces between the proposed core financial system and any feeder or legacy systems. Will the offeror have to provide personnel skilled in the Web Sphere suite?

ANSWER 84: *As noted in Attachment 5, Tab B, "In proposing an implementation strategy, Offerors are not constrained by the approaches described in the CONOPS and EPA reference material posted on its website, as long as the recommended strategy results in improved performance, efficient and effective business processes, lower cost or early accomplishment of milestones." The instructions under Tab B also specify that "(T)he Offeror shall provide a description of each proposed interface to include the use of pre-built components, core system development tools, or third party tools. The Offeror shall rank the level of effort for each task using the scale below. See Section 2.2.1 and Chapter 3 of the CONOPS, and SOO Appendix A for a diagram and list of interfaces." The Offeror should specify its assumptions regarding the use of EPA enterprise tools and related integration activities.*

85. Attachment 5 Tab D Management Approach; Staffing Plan requires "a matrix that provides the major tasks (at a level of detail at least one level below the highest level described in the instructions for Tab B) across the top of the matrix and the following as rows: each organizational element of the proposing team; within each element, the labor categories proposed, ordered by labor rate highest to lowest; a row for EPA staff; a row for EPA PMO contract support; a row or rows for any other resources anticipated for the successful completion of the project. For each cell formed by the intersection of columns and rows the Offeror shall provide the estimated level of effort in hours. Alternatively, the information described may be provided through a MS Project file." Does the Government require hard-copy printouts of this matrix in Volume 3? Is this matrix excluded from the Volume 3 page count limitations?

ANSWER 85: *As stated in Attachment 5, Section 1.1.1, "The Offeror shall provide one (1) original and ten (10) copies for all volumes. The Offeror shall provide two (2) electronic copies on CD of all volumes." The matrix is included in the Volume 3 page count limit.*

86. General - Does the Government intend to award a task order concurrent with award, i.e., on or about August 1, 2006 with performance schedules (due dates, milestones, etc.) determined based on a September 1, 2006 start date? Does the Government intend to award an initial task order of five years in duration?

ANSWER 86: *The Government intends to award a task order concurrent with award for the minimum specified in clause B.3 of the solicitation. For proposal preparation purposes, offerors may assume a contract start date of September 1, 2006.*

87. Section C; C.1; 1.5.8 Application Hosting; "Desktop, local server, LAN and WAN implementation, integration, operation and maintenance activities will be performed by other EPA support and awardee personnel in coordination with the FSMP awardee/COE. Planning of these activities shall be accomplished via coordination with EPA's Office of Technology Operation and Planning. FSMP Help Desk support will be provided by the awardee as 2nd tier, with 1st tier support provided by the EPA Help Desk." Please clarify the scope of services that EPA is looking to the awardee to provide in terms of such desktop, local server, LAN and WAN implementation, integration, operation and maintenance activities.

ANSWER 87: For proposal preparation purposes, offerors should assume EPA will provide desktop, local server, LAN and WAN implementation, integration, operation and maintenance activities inside of EPA's firewall. EPA will also provide Tier 1 help desk services under FSMP. The offeror should assume all other responsibility for providing these services. See Attachment 5, Section 1.2.3, Tab B for additional detail regarding elements which offerors should address in their approach to hosting.

88. G.1 Government Furnished Property for FSMP says that the Government will provide some space on the third floor of the EPA's 633 3rd Street office. In our successful projects, the project team often co-locates with the client. Therefore, are there any other Government buildings in the Washington, DC metropolitan area that we can consider as GFE or where there may be additional space available to lease that would help us locate our project team with the EPA?

ANSWER 88: The specified identified in G.1 is the only space that the Government will make available as GFP. With the exception of GFP specifically identified by the Government, offerors are required furnish the necessary personnel, material, equipment, services and facilities to successfully perform the requirements set forth in the awarded contract.

89. Instructions in Attachment 5 indicate that resumes shall be provided as part of Volume 4. However, pagination requirements listed on page 3 of Attachment 5 state that Volume 3 has a page limit of 145 pages, "not to include past performance references or resumes." Please clarify whether to include resumes solely in Volume 4, or if they are required to be presented in both Volume 3 and Volume 4.

ANSWER 89: Resumes should be included in Volume 4 only.

90. RFP Attachment #5, Section 1.2.3, Tab B references historical data. Is the requirement for 4 years of historical data to be converted expected at the detailed transaction level, or at a summary level?

ANSWER 90: Offerors should expect a portion of the historical data to be at the detailed transaction level and a portion to be at the summary level, depending upon the function required to comply with applicable laws and regulations.

91. Section C.1.10 of the RFP states "[t]he awardee shall be provided Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) for all work performed on a Government site. A description of all GFE is included in clause G.1, entitled 'Government Furnished Property for FSMP'." Section G.1 of the RFP states "[t]he Government will provide space for the successful offeror's project team on the third floor...[and] will include five (5) enclosed offices and 24 cubicles." Later, section 1.2.5.1.d of Attachment 5 states "[f]or pricing and evaluation purposes, offerors shall assume that no Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) will be provided. However, during contract performance, certain items of GFE will be furnished as set forth in the clause in Section H entitled 'Government Furnished Property for FSMP'." Please provide clarification that the office space listed in Section G.1

will be provided to the successful offeror. Additionally, please clarify whether the contractor will be provided desk top computers through the EPA network, telephones, and access to copiers, faxes, etc.

ANSWER 91: Clause C.1, Section 1.10 states "The awardee shall be provided Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) for work performed on a Government site. A description of all GFE is included in clause G.1, entitled "Government Furnished Property for FSMP". The office space listed in Section G.1 will be made available to the successful offeror. For proposal preparation purposes, offerors should assume they will need to furnish the necessary personnel, material, equipment, services and facilities to successfully perform the requirements set forth in the solicitation, with the exception of the GFP specifically identified in G.1.

92. Page 5 of Attachment 9 of the RFP requests "On-Site Fixed Rates". Can the offeror then assume that the rates requested starting on page 2 and ending on page 4 are "Off-Site Fixed Rates"?

ANSWER 92: Yes

93. The Government requests substantial data throughout Section 1.2.5.6 of Attachment 5, including direct labor rates and loading factors. For an offeror who intends to use approved rates from an existing Government contract (e.g., GWAC), with all subcontractors also fitting underneath these labor categories/rates, is it necessary to provide the rate backup information requested in Section 1.2.5.6 of Attachment 5?

ANSWER 93: Yes

94. The Government in Section 1.2.5.6.h of Attachment 5 requests all backup for subcontractors in the same format as the prime offeror when the subcontractors are expected to receive substantial (5 percent or \$100,000, whichever is less) work share. As it might be burdensome for the offerors to provide, and the Government to review, all the backup documentation for every subcontractor with as little as \$100,000 in work over an expected 120 month period of performance, would the Government consider raising this floor by removing the \$100,000 criteria, and focusing solely on the 5% minimum?

ANSWER 94: The language at Attachment 5, Section 1.2.5.6 (h) is revised to begin "Team Subcontracts. When the cost of a subcontract is substantial (5 percent of the total estimated contract dollar value or \$500,000, whichever is less), the offeror shall include the following subcontractor information:"

95. We have questions concerning the Certifications in Section K as they pertain to public sector Centers of Excellence. Many of these clauses do not apply to the Government. Should we respond as such and at the same time have any teaming partner make these certifications, for example, provision K.6, should we respond with the teaming partners certification that they are not debarred, suspended, etc.?

ANSWER 95: The provisions in Section K have been reviewed by the EPA.

There do not appear to be any provisions which a public sector COE is required to answer, for which there is not a means by which the public sector COE can reasonably respond. Public Sector offerors are exempt from the CAS requirements of provision K.16. Offerors are reminded that many provisions and clauses within the solicitation contain flow-down requirements for subcontractors.

96. Demo Script- 4.0 Budget Execution/Ref # 4.1.2
In budget execution, what is function (F37), and what does the EPA want to do with multi year plan (ECO). How does the EPA accommodate these today?

ANSWER 96: Function is simply an additional level of budget execution below the Agency level. The same holds true for multi-year plan. These are examples of the types of controls that an office could place on their budget. These are office specific execution levels. The reason for having these levels is for the offeror to demonstrate that their proposed solution can meet our requirements - up to eight levels of budget execution. EPA's created the solution demonstration scenarios to enable the Agency to evaluate how the proposed solution meets the referenced requirements. EPA's functional requirements represent the Agency's needs. The requirements are not necessarily replications of current EPA practices or system capabilities. "F37" is simply a code to be used in the scenario to demonstrate the solution's ability to meet this requirement.

Multi-year plan represents a set of activities needed to achieve part or all of an objective of the strategic plan. Within the accounting classification, the use of multi-year plan enables EPA to associate resources associated with achieving all or part of an objective across the budget years covered by the strategic plan.

97. Demo Script - 3.0 Budget Formulation/ Introduction, 2nd paragraph
How is the crosscut for Agency Media Program identified currently within BAS and within the Budget Execution Area? It appears to be different than the program/project code. Is that correct? Is this NPM? Do programs/projects have unique Agency Media Programs or do they split to different ones?

ANSWER 97: Crosscuts for Agency Media Programs are carried in BAS in tables separate from program / projects. A crosscut is essentially an alternate view of some portion of the budget, and consists of aggregates of unique combinations of elements of the accounting classification code (e.g., a particular combination of appropriation, NPM, and program project). The dollar values of crosscuts are maintained in BAS through mappings between a set of unique accounting classification elements and the crosscut; the mappings may include percent allocations from a source element to two or more target crosscuts.

98. Will EPA provide the implementation phase funding profiles to assist offerors in shaping their

proposed solutions?

Answer 98: EPA assumes that the question is asking for EPA's project funding schedule. No, EPA will not provide this information. As stated in Section 1.3 of Attachment 5 (and throughout the solicitation), EPA expects offeror's to propose implementation approaches and schedules that the offeror believes best supports its implementation approach.

99. Part III of the FM LOB Checklist appears to be a self assessment, but instructions are silent as to whether the Offeror or EPA is required to complete this section. Please clarify.

ANSWER 99: The offeror is required to complete Part III of the FM LOB checklist.

4. The clause at 52.204-9 entitled "Personal Identity Verification of Contractor Personnel (JAN 2006)" has been added. The text is as follows:

(a) The Contractor shall comply with agency personal identity verification procedures identified in the contract that implement Homeland Security Presidential Directive-12 (HSPD-12), Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guidance M-05-24, and Federal Information Processing Standards Publication (FIPS PUB) Number 201.

(b) The Contractor shall insert this clause in all subcontracts when the subcontractor is required to have physical access to a federally-controlled facility or access to a Federal information system